

6/22/98 J. V. Graff 10,000
DU627 M. F. R
4
68

There is no constitutional disability as to the acquisition of territory, and whether, when acquired, it may be taken into the Union by the Constitution as it now stands will become a question of expediency.

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH V. GRAFF,
OF ILLINOIS,
ON THE
ANNEXATION OF THE HAWAIIAN ISLANDS,
IN THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

25.10
5357
JUNE 13, 1898.

But in determining this question it is not the acquiring of territory to satisfy pride or the greed of possession that influences me. Territorial expansion is not the need of the hour, but, in my judgment, the central and controlling factor in the determination to annex the Hawaiian Islands is that it will aid in our commercial expansion.

WASHINGTON.

1898.

J. V. G.

P
Mr. W. A. Smith

32100

DU 627
4
G8

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH V. GRAFF.

The House having under consideration the joint resolution (H. Res. 253) to provide for annexing the Hawaiian Islands to the United States—

Mr. GRAFF said:

Mr. SPEAKER: In arriving at a judgment regarding the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands I was not hampered by any previously formed or expressed opinion concerning the subject, and therefore was able to give the matter a conscientious, careful, and unprejudiced examination. I have been affected in reaching a conclusion, first, by what appears to be the sentiment of the American people. I have great confidence in their good judgment, and it is justified by the manner in which they have met the various crises through which the Republic has passed and the manner in which they have shown themselves competent to deal with the most complex questions.

A notable illustration of this we had in the last campaign. They sat in their meetings and at the fireside, and even in the shops and stores, and carefully delved into the complicated question presented, and, in my judgment, the verdict which they finally rendered was well ripened, mature, and wise. They are a courageous, but a conservative people. They have all due respect for the traditions of the fathers, and yet have a well-founded confidence in their ability to meet the problems of the future, which are for them, and not for those departed, to solve. I have ample evidence collected during the last few weeks that the great majority of the American people are in favor of the annexation of these islands in the Pacific Ocean. In the next place, so far as the advantages of annexation are concerned as a strategic, military, and naval base, I have yielded to the judgment of the experts of the Army and the Navy of the United States, and of the Administration. General Schofield, the last one of those surviving who were prominent in the late rebellion as a commanding officer, and one who by experience and ability has shown himself to be worthy of regard concerning a question of this character, stated to the House Committee on Foreign Relations that the most important feature of all is that it economizes the naval force rather than increases it. He said also:

It is capable of absolute defense by shore batteries, so that a naval fleet after going there and replenishing its supplies and making what repairs are needed, can go away and leave the harbor perfectly safe to the protection of the army. The Spanish fleet on the Asiatic station was the only one of all the fleets we could have overcome as we did. Of course, that can not again happen, for we will not be able to pick up the weakest fellow next time. We

are liable at any time to get into a war with a nation which has a more powerful fleet than ours, and it is of vital importance, therefore, if we can, to hold the point from which they can conduct operations against our Pacific coast. Especially is that true until the Nicaragua Canal is finished, because we can not send the fleet around from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

In addition to this, Admiral Walker, who has had an extended experience in the waters of the Hawaiian Islands, emphatically confirms General Schofield, saying that it would cost far less to protect the Pacific coast with the Hawaiian Islands than without them; that it would be taking a point of vantage instead of giving it to the enemy.

It must be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that we have a coast line of nearly 2,000 miles on the Pacific, and our Alaskan coast line is greater in extent than our Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coast lines combined. To my inexpert mind, it would seem that modern ships of war and commerce as well require facilities for coaling and for frequent docking for repairs. We are entirely without this, and that, too, in the great expanse of the Pacific Ocean. With millions of square miles of water around them, it rises above the waves a single and only fortress of the sea and now offered to us for the taking. It must be remembered that the Pacific Ocean from our own coast is on an average more than 5,000 miles wide, twice that at least of the Atlantic and four times in area. England at least realizes the importance of such harbors of refuge and bases of supply and has established fortified coaling stations all around the world in the pathways of commerce. A cruiser or battle ship with a coal capacity necessary to carry her 5,000 miles, steaming at 10 knots an hour, will exhaust her coal in less than 1,000 miles by doubling her speed. With a supply of coal well guarded in Pearl Harbor, our war ships and merchantmen can cross the Pacific at the maximum speed or concentrate at distant points at high speed, thus largely increasing their efficiency, while their adversaries, being under the necessity of conserving their coal or risking the running out of coal away from their own ports, must move at much less speed, thus being placed at great disadvantage.

England, Germany, France, Japan, the United States, and once Spain, all have a Pacific squadron. Every one of these is stronger than ours, save that of Spain, which was the weakest. But the Administration has asked for the annexation, and the President has placed the military and naval advantage as one of the causes. This has also contributed to forming my opinion. To-day the people of this country are back of the Administration and the conduct of this war and in all those things which are necessary to its successful prosecution as viewed by the Administration as they have never been behind any Administration from the commencement of this Government. Therefore, not being a military expert myself, I yield to the judgment of the Administration upon that point. But to me the controlling factor in the determination of this question is its importance from a commercial standpoint.

War is not our normal condition; we desire to pursue rather the arts of peace, and when war comes it can never be resorted to by the American people except upon justifiable grounds and as a necessity. To me, therefore, war is simply an incident, a most glorious one, but yet simply an incident in the determination of action upon these resolutions for annexation. I think it is unfortunate that in the discussion of this question the problem of the

retention of the Philippine Islands should have been brought into consideration. I am not afraid that we shall be hysterical, and because we have annexed the Hawaiian Islands shall be intoxicated with an uncontrollable desire for territorial aggrandizement.

I do not believe that the decision of the present question will influence our judgment when we come to settle the Philippine problem. This has not been our history; it has not been the history of Congress. But in determining this question it is not the acquiring of territory to satisfy pride or the greed of possession that influences me. Territorial expansion is not the need of the hour, but, in my judgment, the central and controlling factor in the determination to annex the Hawaiian Islands is that it will aid in our commercial expansion. We must remember that marvelous as has been our growth in population, from 3,000,000 people at the close of the Revolution to 73,000,000 to-day, it is surpassed in the wonderful increase of the productive power of this country through improved machinery, the product of American genius.

Whether this fact be a matter of congratulation or regret, no legislative power can stop it. The difference between the amount which could formerly be produced by a given number of laboring men and that which can be produced with the machinery of to-day operated by the same number passes comprehension. It is a problem to be met. There is much to congratulate ourselves upon under present conditions. I believe that we should first take care of our own market, as we have done, through the policy of protection. But we must also put our foot upon the sea. We must have our share of the world's commerce. I am to-day informed by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] that the Treasury statistics show that from February 1 of the present year to the end of the present month each month's receipts under the Dingley bill are sufficient to pay the peace expenses of the nation, basing those expenses upon the expenses of each month corresponding for the last year, and leave a surplus on July 1 of \$10,000,000, and that, too, in the face of the fact that importers, anticipating this protection feature of the Dingley bill, flooded our markets, especially with one year's supply of wool, thus materially lessening the possibility of large revenue receipts during the first year of its operation. I give below a table of the exports of merchandise manufactured in this country, not including coin or bullion of any kind, with the value of each year's exportation, commencing with the passage of the McKinley Act, in 1890:

Exports of merchandise.

Year ending June 30—	Value.	Year ending June 30—	Value.
1890.....	\$845,293,823	1894.....	\$892,140,572
1891.....	872,270,253	1895.....	807,528,165
1892.....	1,015,732,011	1896.....	882,606,998
1893.....	831,090,785	1897.....	1,050,993,506

It is somewhat significant that of the two years in which we sold abroad the largest amount of agricultural and manufactured products one should be under the operation of the McKinley Act and the other under the Administration of McKinley, and the next year will surpass, according to the estimate of the Treasury Department, that of the present; or the exports for the nine months ending march 31, 1898, are \$910,612,651, which would

make the exports for year ending June 30, 1898, \$1,214,150,201. But the struggle is ever necessary and ever unending. We can not be blind to the fact that the four great European powers, England, Russia, France, and Germany, are endeavoring to obtain commercial supremacy of the world by the policy of colonization. The territory of Africa is speedily being divided between the great powers, and now already has commenced the parceling out of the Empire of China between them. More than one-half of the population of the world is in countries upon the Pacific and Indian oceans. Hon. J. R. Procter, in an article he wrote for the Forum in September, 1897, says:

The foreign commerce of the countries bordering these oceans, excluding North America, already amounts to over \$2,250,000,000 a year. Of this great commerce we as yet have but a small fraction. Over 80 per cent of our total exports go eastward across the Atlantic and less than 5 per cent westward.

Nor can we ignore the new constitutional monarchy of Japan which has awakened from its sleep of centuries and startled the world with its progressiveness and power. Are we to be prepared for this changing of the front of the world's market? Are we to forget that we are between two oceans? I verily believe that the commercial conflict of the future is to be for the trade of the Orient.

We are no longer simply an agricultural nation, and it is not for the interests of the farmer that we should be that alone. The splendid victory of Dewey at Manila has not aroused us to dreams of territorial aggrandizement, but it has awakened us to the necessity of ports of our own under the American flag where our vessels may seek refuge and coal all over the world. We wish to see the American flag floating on every sea over goods manufactured by American workmen and cereals raised by American farmers shipped in American bottoms. When the American goes to the Orient, or wherever he goes the round world over, we want it understood that he is a citizen of a Republic which protects the commercial and personal interests of the American citizen wherever he may be. This is not "jingoism." This is a practical possibility. I am not in favor of commercial expansion for any other reason than the benefit of the 73,000,000 people whom we have within our present boundaries. And if in the annexation of Hawaii we can give them the privileges of our Government, to our own advantage, we have enough of caution and discretion to meet the Philippine problem when it comes upon its own merits.

We did not seek to wage this war for territory. We entered into it because Spain had forfeited her rights to govern the Island of Cuba, and because her misgovernment had been an evil both to that unhappy people and to our own commercial interests. We sought, according to the usages of war, because Spain persisted in resisting, to strike her wherever we could find a vital point, and we certainly are not called upon to allow the expenses of this war, prolonged by Spain, to be paid other than out of any of her possessions of which we may have control at its close. Our right under the Constitution to acquire territory by conquest, annexation, or purchase has been too well established by precedents in our own history to be questioned. At the time of the Louisiana purchase Jefferson wrote to Gallatin:

There is no constitutional disability as to the acquisition of territory, and whether, when acquired, it may be taken into the Union by the Constitution as it now stands will become a question of expediency.

The Democratic members of this House last night held a caucus, and one of their members therein offered a resolution to the

effect that the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands was dangerous, unwise, and un-Democratic. But the word "un-Democratic" was stricken from the resolution, as it wisely might be, and as amended the resolution passed.

Florida was ceded by Spain in 1819 without the consent of the Spanish population of Florida. Louisiana was purchased from France in 1803 without the consent of the French population of Louisiana. Texas was annexed in 1845, and that not by treaty ratified by the Senate, but by an act of annexation passed by both Houses of Congress, as we are attempting to pass these resolutions, and yet this method is now pronounced unconstitutional by one of the members on the other side of this Chamber. California was ceded by Mexico in 1848. The Gadsden purchase was made 1853, and the purchase of Alaska finally in 1867. In considering the form of government which we would give to the Hawaiian Islands it may be remembered that we delayed admitting portions of the acquired territory for more than eighty years, and parts of it still remain unadmitted as States.

The total area of the United States at present is, in round numbers, 3,668,000 square miles. It was originally only about 1,132,000 square miles. Thus by these acquisitions, after the formation of our Government, we tripled our territory and acquired all we now have west of the Mississippi, as well as Louisiana and Florida. And I am frank to say that the proudest part of the history of the Democratic party was that to it was due the greatest credit for these acquisitions. It seems to me that it is very inconsistent for them now to grow so very conservative over the acquisition of a little group of islands in the midst of the sea. It must also be remembered that the Whig party suffered by reason of its opposition to the Mexican war which resulted in the acquisition of the California territory ceded by Mexico; and the same forebodings existed then as are brought up to-day, and the arguments made now are repetitions of those days.

We remember that the Whig party only escaped condemnation by the wise selection of the old hero of the Mexican war, Zachary Taylor, who snatched victory from the jaws of defeat. The leader of the party on the opposite side of this Chamber would not be here were it not for the annexation of Texas. This is not a new question. The value of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States has been recognized by almost every Secretary of State for the last half century.

There is a little Republic in Italy 4 miles from the shore of the Adriatic, away up in the Apennine Mountains, thirteen hundred years old, consisting of five villages, with some 8,000 inhabitants, and 22 square miles, entirely mountainous. There is little or no use for the prison. She is not a tempting prize to the stronger powers of Europe. Her people are industrious, prudent, and economical. She does not intermeddle with the world outside. She shuts out the telephone, the railroad, and all of the modern appliances of this age. They have been kept in simplicity, yes; in liberty, yes; but they also have been kept in ignorance. They enjoy liberty bound up within themselves, but not such a liberty as we would or can enjoy. They have no part in the world's work. We can not escape it. If they had existed from the time of Adam, we would have lived longer in our hundred and nineteen years of national life than they.

We frequently hear men longing for the simplicity of the primitive times of the beginning of this Government. Perhaps some



0 019 944 334 3

may think it would be better. It matters not. Sir, we can not turn the wheels of progress back, if we would. We must meet the problems of the future. We can not rely upon the principles laid down for the settling of the problems of the past, when we were an agricultural Republic alone, to meet the problems of the future of a great commercial power, except as they may be applicable to the present time. I have confidence in the present and, above all, I have a confidence in the guiding power of the God of nations, who has directed us thus far in preserving a liberty which is not one simply for ourselves, not an exclusive privilege, but is typified in the statue at New York Harbor of Liberty Enlightening the World. [Applause.]